

CA No. 151/2019
S.S. Duggal Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation

24.03.2026

Present: Sh. Amit Khanna, Ld. Counsel for appellant alongwith appellant in person.
Ms. Priyanka Soni, Ld. SPP for respondent/CBI alongwith Sh. Ravi Raj Khatik, HIO in person.

The CBI has filed the compliance report in terms of order dated 16.03.2026 while submitting that they does not possess either original documents or photocopy documents from Ex.PW9/1 to Ex.PW9/5 and therefore they cannot produce such documents before the present Court at this stage of proceedings for the purpose of reconstruction.

The original of the above compliance report be placed both in fact finding inquiry and in the main case file. Hence it is desirable that the fact finding inquiry be decided prior to further proceedings in the main case file as it involves the question as to the fact whether the CBI had at all filed the above documents before the present Court.

The plea of CBI is also heard in the fact finding inquiry and they have consistently pleaded that the relevant documents are filed by them during recording of evidence in this case.

At this stage when ld. SPP for respondent/CBI is asked that

//2//

when the said documents Ex.PW9/1 to Ex.PW9/5 were filed by them then they have failed to submit any specific date when the same was filed before the present Court.

Further, it is also submitted that the same were not filed during recording of evidence but they were filed before the recording of evidence in the present matter. Now it is pleaded by Id. SPP for respondent/CBI Ms. Priyanka Soni that the above documents were filed before the present Court at the time of filing of chargesheet. It is further submitted on behalf of CBI that they have submitted GEQD opinion alongwith chargesheet, therefore, the documents in original must have been filed by them before the present Court. However they have failed to show such documents in the list of documents available on record. It is submitted by the Id. Counsel for appellant/accused that there are other questioned documents which are specifically part of list of documents dated 30.01.1992 at serial no. 10, 11 and 12 in the list of documents and not the missing documents. However Ex.PW9/1 to Ex.PW9/5 does not find mention in such list.

It is further submitted on behalf of CBI that the supply of documents must have been made to the accused under Section 207 Cr. PC. However Id. Counsel for appellant has submitted that such supply of documents must have been made as per the list of documents filed by the CBI on record and not otherwise. It is submitted that these documents were not filed among list of documents.

Hence submission on behalf of both the parties are

//3//

complete in respect of above missing documents both for the purpose of reconstruction and also in the fact finding inquiry. Hence matter be listed for order on fact finding inquiry and also regarding reconstruction of above documents on **15.04.2026**.

Written arguments may be filed by both the parties with supply of advance copy to each other within 03 days from tomorrow.

(JOGINDER PRAKASH NAHAR)
Additional Sessions Judge (FTC-01)
Tis Hazari Court/Delhi/24.03.2026